



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

ml

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,118	03/31/2006	Peter Bauer	2002P01581WOUS	4347
46726 7590 10/05/2007 BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD NEW BERN, NC 28562			EXAMINER TRAN, HANH VAN	
			ART UNIT 3637	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/543,118	Applicant(s) BAUER ET AL.	
	Examiner Hanh V. Tran	Art Unit 3637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 July 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/22/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the First Office Action on the Merits from the examiner in charge of this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 15-20, 22-25, 28-31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 02/065036 to Bukulmez et al.

Bukulmez et al discloses a refrigerating appliance comprising all the elements recited in the above listed claims including a body, comprising: a door 2 abutting the body in a closed position; a display element 3; a viewing window 13 formed on said body; and said viewing window 13 oriented such that said display element 3 is visible when said door is closed, said door comprising: an outer wall; an inner wall; said outer wall and said inner wall interconnected along their longitudinal and transverse edges forming a space therebetween to form a depth for the door; and one transverse edge formed with said viewing window 13 extending over said depth of door, said door having a rectangular outline and a pair of shorter rectangular sides and a pair of longer rectangular sides joining said shorter sides into said rectangular outline, including said

viewing window 13 formed on one of said shorter rectangular sides of said door serving as said transverse edge, a transverse edge of said outer wall and a corresponding transverse edge of said inner wall lie opposite one another and an opening serving as said viewing window formed over said depth of said door, said transverse edge of said outer wall has said viewing window formed therein serving as a recess and projecting over said corresponding transverse edge of said inner wall, a first end element 9 affixed to the edge of said outer wall and an edge of said inner wall, said first end element and said outer and inner walls define an insulating intermediate space, said first end element following the contour of said viewing window, a transparent pane 14 arranged in said viewing window 13, with said pane 14 inserted in a window cut-out formed in said end element 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 21, 26, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bukulmez et al.

Bukulmez et al discloses all the elements as discussed above except for the pane formed integrally with said end element, and said pane formed from an opaque material.

In regard to the pane formed integrally with the end element (instead of two parts), the examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious to have the pane of Bukulmez formed integrally with the end element, since it is well known that constructing formerly various structures into a single or integral structure or vice versa involves only routine and well within the level of one skill in the art. In regard to the pane formed from an opaque material, the examiner takes the position that it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skill in the art to form a pane/panel with either a transparent or opaque material based on the intended usage of said pane/panel.

7. Claims 27 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bukulmez et al in view of DE 9218613 to Licentia.

Bukulmez et al discloses all the elements as discussed above except for the door including a non-transparent decoration formed at least on a portion of the back of the pane.

Licentia teaches the idea of providing a household appliance with a non-transparent decoration in a panel for aesthetic purpose. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of Bukulmez et al by providing the door with a non-

Art Unit: 3637

transparent decoration for aesthetic purpose, as taught by Licentia, since both teach alternate conventional household appliance structure, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Helfrich, Jr., Midlang et al, Tirrell et al, Jeon, Onaka et al, Kelsey, Hiraoka et al, Carter et al, Oyler et al, Froehner et al, Hosono, Morimoto, and Takagi et al all show structures similar to various elements of applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hanh V. Tran', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

HVT

September 29, 2007

Hanh V. Tran
Art Unit 3637